

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Attests of ANNO at SPIC STATECTS AND TRADE AND ACCESS WAS ASSESSED TO A CONTRACT OF A SPICE AND TRADE AND T

APPLICATION NO	FIEING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	A LIORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09.596,755	06 15 2000	Hisashi Ohtani	07977/226002 US3548DI	3261
75	(93.3), 2003			
Scott C Harris			EXAMBNER	
Fish & Richard: Suite 500			KUNEMUND, ROBERT	
4350 La Jolla Village Drive San Diego, CA 92122			ARTUNIT	PAPER NUMBER
8				

DATE MAILED: 03/31-2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

	1+ (-		
Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/596,755	OHTANI, HISASHI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Robert M Kunemund	1765		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a

final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	i
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $4$ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee und 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce an example patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ler i in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying issues for appeal; and/or	the
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>see note</u> .	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendme canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	nt
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>see note</u> .	<del>)</del>
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: 2-48	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.	

NUBER OF HER E DRIMARY AYAM

Application/Control Number: 09/596,755

Art Unit: 1765

Applicant's arguments filed March 21, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' amendment to the claims of "peak of a temperature" creates new matter and new issues. There is no support in the specification for such limitations of a peak temperature. Further, this limitation creates issues, which have not been claimed previous to this amendment.

Applicants' argument concerning the 112 rejections is noted. However, the citations from the specification supplied by applicants are taken out of context and when read with the specification do not support the instant claims. The dopant cite does not teach scanning light or two sets of light as claimed. Further, the specification teaches that in order to obtain the crystallization of silicon the metal is needed.